

# CURRENT NEWS **EARLY BIRD**

WEDNESDAY, April 8, 1998

Washington Times

April 8, 1998

Pg. 1

## Cohen tells Reno gay sailor must go

### Insists any settlement be cleared by Navy

By Rowan Scarborough  
THE WASHINGTON TIMES

Defense Secretary William S. Cohen, in a letter to the attorney general, is strongly backing the Navy's decision to discharge a sailor whom homosexual groups cite as a victim of the military's abuse of the "don't ask, don't tell" policy.

In an April 1 letter to Attorney General Janet Reno, a copy of which was obtained by The Washington Times, Mr. Cohen cautioned the Justice Department that any settlement it strikes with Senior Chief Petty Officer Timothy R. McVeigh must be approved by the Navy.

The Navy's move to discharge Chief McVeigh has emerged as a stern test of the military's ban on open homosexuality because his purported declaration was contained in an anonymous profile he posted on America Online. A federal judge ruled the Navy violated

Chief McVeigh's privacy and has blocked his ouster.

Administration sources said Mr. Cohen's letter is an attempt to head off any move by the Justice Department to let Chief McVeigh retire, with pay benefits, three years short of the required 20 years. The sources said this would leave the door open for other discharged personnel to gain retirement pay.

"We support the approach to the McVeigh case that you have recommended, so long as it is clear that any settlement of this case must be on terms acceptable to the Navy," Mr. Cohen said in his letter.

The defense secretary also sought assurances from Miss Reno that any deal doesn't "represent any diminution of your support for that policy, and that you and your colleagues would be prepared to assist us in communicating that fact to the field."

Administration sources said Mr. Cohen's personal backing for the Navy in this case provides a sig-

nificant boost for the service at a time when it is under intense criticism from homosexual rights groups, the federal judge, and some Justice Department officials.

Administration officials said Mr. Cohen dispatched the letter after he met last week with Adm. Jay Johnson, chief of naval operations, who convinced the secretary the Navy had acted properly. The day before, Miss Reno met with top Navy officials to discuss the McVeigh case. She told them she planned to explore settlement talks with Chief McVeigh's attorney.

In his letter to Miss Reno, Mr. Cohen left no doubt where he stands.

"We feel strongly that the district court's decision in that case is plainly erroneous in numerous respects, and that it should be appealed," Mr. Cohen wrote. "We understand that you share our view that the decision is erroneous, and that the Navy's action with respect to Senior Chief McVeigh were fully consistent with the statute governing homosexual conduct in the military and with our own regulations on that subject."

U.S. District Judge Stanley Sporkin ruled in January that the Navy violated the "don't ask, don't tell" policy by relying on information gleaned from the sailor's on-line profile.

Chief McVeigh's e-mail to the

## Report downplaying Cuba threat back for review

Miami Herald...See Pg. 3

## Albanian weapons cross to Kosovo

### Militants seek 'blood revenge'

Washington Times...See Pg. 3

## Accusers must weigh options

European Stars & Stripes...See Pg. 4



This publication is prepared by American Forces Information Service (AFIS/OASD-PA) to bring to the attention of key personnel news items of interest to them in their official capacities. It is not intended to substitute for newspapers and periodicals as a means of keeping informed about the meaning and impact of news developments. Use of these articles does not reflect official endorsement. Further reproduction for private use or gain is subject to original copyright restrictions. Please pass this copy on to someone else who needs current news information, then...



wife of an enlisted man described the sender as "boysrch" — an apparent abbreviation of the words "boy search." When the wife clicked on the sender's on-line profile, the word "gay" was listed as marital status.

Since Chief McVeigh didn't voluntarily "tell" his homosexual status to superiors, Judge Sporkin ordered the Navy to reinstate the enlisted man aboard the attack submarine USS Chicago. The Navy has assigned him to shore duty in Hawaii.

The ruling has touched off an internal debate in the Clinton administration. The Navy wants the Justice Department to appeal, even if Chief McVeigh leaves the service. The Justice Department

on March 31 filed papers saying it intended to appeal.

The case has proved troublesome for the Navy. AOL has acknowledged violating Chief McVeigh's privacy by providing a Navy official with the profiler's identify. The Navy claims the regulations under "don't ask, don't tell" — which allow homosexuals to continue serving in the military if they keep their sexual orientation private — allowed Navy investigators to continue their probe.

In the on-line profile, the chief petty officer said his hobbies were "driving, boy watching, and collecting 'pictures' of other young studs. (Send some and I'll reply)."

The Defense Department, after a review of how commanders are enforcing "don't ask, don't tell," yesterday released a report saying the policy is fair.

The report said 80 percent of those discharged for homosexuality in 1997 had admitted their sexuality.

The number discharged rose from 850 in 1996 to 997 last year.

"I think [the policy] is working," Mr. Cohen said on Monday. "We intend to continue to emphasize the fact that this policy should not be abused, that there should be no attempt to hunt or seek out those who may be homosexual, and that we intend to strictly enforce the 'don't ask, don't tell' policy."

Philadelphia Inquirer

April 8, 1998

Pg. 2

# Guidelines planned on gays in military

Cohen says the aim is to explain and enforce the policy against harassing and pursuing gays.

By Susanne M. Schafer  
ASSOCIATED PRESS

WASHINGTON — Defense Secretary William S. Cohen ordered new guidelines yesterday to explain and enforce the Clinton administration's policy barring the pursuit and harassment of homosexuals in the military, saying it was possible that "some commanders haven't gotten the message."

Members of the military who engage in witch-hunts, Cohen warned, will "be the subject of their own investigation" and potentially charged with sexual harassment.

"I have tried to make it very clear that we want this policy fully and fairly implemented," Cohen said on National Public Radio. "That means there's to be no pursuit, there's to be no harassment, and if it's taking place, it's something I'm very concerned about."

The "don't ask, don't tell, don't pursue" policy was initiated in 1994 amid great controversy, aiming to strike a balance between prohibited homosexual conduct in the military and efforts to maintain the privacy of those who choose not to declare

their sexual orientation.

Meanwhile, the Defense Department released a report showing that the number of people discharged for homosexuality climbed from 850 in 1996 to 997 last year. The lowest number discharged was 617 in 1994, while the highest in recent years numbered 1,998 in 1982, the report said. The high number amounted to 0.095 percent of the total force.

The report also said that 80 percent of those discharged for homosexuality in 1997 had made a statement that they were homosexual. More than 80 percent of those discharged had less than four years of service, the study said.

The secretary said he did not think the new figures indicated that harassment was on the rise.

The report argued that the policy was being fairly and properly enforced, Cohen noted, but he added: "It's conceivable, and it's possible, that some commanders haven't gotten the message."

Some of Cohen's other recommendations include:

- Military commanders should consult with their superiors and military legal authorities before embarking on investigations of service members believed to be homosexual.
- The service secretaries must approve authorizations for investigations in situations dubbed "coming-out" cases.

- Commanders and investigators should receive more training on the policy.

The report said without elaboration that in only three cases had the policy not been properly enforced.

Critics of the policy said Cohen would not have issued the directives if the policy were being properly enforced.

"The policy itself is not being followed down the chain of command, and the core problem of antigay bias goes completely unaddressed," said a statement issued by Winnie Stachelberg, political director of the Human Rights Campaign, a national gay political organization. "The policy is not working because commanders in the field are continuing to ask and pursue, hunting down gay service members unabated."

## NOTICE TO READERS

The Current News *Early Bird*, *Supplement*, and *Radio-TV Defense Dialog* are available at <http://ebird.dtic.mil>. Read detailed instructions on the *Early Bird* "home page" or call (703) 695-2884 or DSN 225-2884. These electronic publications are intended only for DoD and .mil sites and cannot be made available to any other addresses.

# Report downplaying Cuba threat back for review

Miami Herald

April 8, 1998

Pg. 1

By Christopher Marquis  
Herald Staff Writer

WASHINGTON -- Defense Secretary William Cohen has ordered a "ground-up review" of a Pentagon report that said Cuba poses no major security threat to the United States, after strong complaints from Sen. Bob Graham, the Florida Democrat who requested it, a top Graham aide said.

Cohen has asked defense intelligence officers to reconsider the still unreleased report in light of Graham's specifications that it focus on Cuba's capabilities -- and not the likelihood -- of its staging nonconventional attacks, said Bob Filippone, Graham's national security aide.

"It's gone back for a ground-up review," Filippone said. "They're taking a fresh look at it."

Pentagon spokesman Lt. Col. Steve Campbell said only that the report, which was due to be handed to Congress by March 31, "is still in the review process." He declined to

say whether Cohen had sent it back to its authors for changes.

"Beyond that, there's not much I can tell you about the report," Campbell said. "We expect it shortly."

## Shift of position

If Cohen demands major revisions to the report, he would be opting against the Defense Intelligence Agency and senior Pentagon officers responsible for the region, in favor of a politically potent constituency in Florida and elsewhere that identifies Cuba as a regional menace years after it lost its Soviet patronage and its economy imploded.

Cohen said March 30 that he expected the report on his desk that afternoon and would comment on it "within the next several days." The report was to be classified, with an annex available to the public.

But a Herald article March 29 about the report's conclusions stirred an outcry among Cuban-American lawmakers and Graham, a longtime critic of Cuban President Fidel Castro, who found himself scrambling

to explain why a report he had sought downplayed the threat posed by Castro.

"It was my intention that this report would force the Defense Department to assess Cuban capabilities to threaten the United States and, since Castro has a long record of using his capability against the United States, prepare contingency plans to respond to any threat from Cuba," Graham told the Senate last week.

Graham voiced concerns about Cuba's ability to produce biological weapons; its reported training of commandos in Vietnam and western Cuba; its support of a Soviet spy station capable of eavesdropping on U.S. communications, and its longstanding use of "mass migration as a policy tool."

## Military concerns

The senator also warned that base closure and realignment decisions, especially affecting Homestead Air Reserve Base and Key West Naval Air Station, have "eroded" the U.S. ability to respond to Cuban attacks.

"Cuba, under Fidel Castro's dictatorial regime, has a well-documented history of threatening the national security of the United States," Graham said. "From the Cuban missile crisis, to the Mariel boatlift, to the Brothers to the Rescue shoot-down, the pattern of provocation and threat to the well-being of Americans is clear. Unfortunately, what is also clear is a pattern of unpreparedness on the part of the United States to respond to Cuban provocations."

In recent remarks to The Herald, Marine Gen. Charles Wilhelm, the head of the U.S. Southern Command in Miami and an important contributor to the report, said the Cuban military "has no capability whatsoever to project itself beyond the borders of Cuba."

Marine Gen. John Sheehan, Ret., who last month became the highest ranking U.S. officer to visit Cuba since the 1959 revolution, described the Cuban military's "defensive" posture and conveyed Castro's own vow to do nothing to embarrass President Clinton.

Washington Times

April 8, 1998

Pg. 1

# Albanian weapons cross to Kosovo

## Militants seek 'blood revenge'

By Philip Smucker  
THE WASHINGTON TIMES

KRUMA, Albania — Here in Albania's lawless highlands, leaders of the Kosovo liberation movement are buying guns and missiles and organizing for "blood revenge" against Serbian police who killed

more than 80 Kosovo residents last month.

Dozens of young men arrive daily, ready to take up arms in an all-out war for independence in neighboring Kosovo — a region of southwestern Yugoslavia where the mainly ethnic Albanian population chafes under Serbian rule.

One recent morning, fresh recruits from across Europe could be seen packing hundreds of Kalashnikov rifles and anti-aircraft weapons under the direction of an aging leader of the Kosovo Liberation Army, or UCK.

They said the weapons — including sophisticated anti-aircraft devices looted from Albanian government armories during a chaotic mass uprising last year — would be clandestinely moved into Kosovo by men and mules in the coming days.

"Soon we'll all be fighting," said one man as he loaded the arms onto a flatbed truck. "This will be a second Bosnia."

The UCK, whose attacks on Serbian policemen sparked a series of retaliatory raids in March that left more than 80 people dead, has of-

fices in Switzerland and pledges to free Kosovo from Serbian control.

Its leaders say they direct village "self-defense" units deep inside Kosovo from bases here inside Albania.

They say they have no faith in international efforts led by Secretary of State Madeleine K. Albright to promote a dialogue with Yugoslav President Slobodan Milosevic.

"We are not waiting for 200,000 dead as in Bosnia," said a guerrilla leader who served as a commando in the Yugoslav army a decade ago. "The Serbs will never be pardoned. For each one of us who dies, there is another coming to fight."

The separatist leader spoke in a chilly, smoke-filled bar, where he jabbed his finger at a map of Yugoslavia. He asked to be identified only by his nom de guerre, "Black Eagle," to protect his wife and children in Kosovo.

The man said he had worked as a security specialist in several European cities before arriving on the border a month ago.

Black Eagle said the UCK is prepared to "take blood revenge in Belgrade," the Yugoslavian capital,

if Serbian police and army units continue their "brutal ethnic cleansing actions" inside Kosovo.

A four-day visit to this gun-laden and anarchic border region revealed a strong network of men and arms available to the UCK.

In villages stretched along the 20-mile length of Lake Peerzes, the UCK is recruiting young men and commandeering the "self-defense" network set up by Albania's late dictator, Enver Hoxha, whose rule left the mountainsides dotted with thousands of mushroom-shaped bunkers.

At the base of an abandoned copper mine, villagers emptied plastic sacks filled with some of the 600,000 Kalashnikovs that disappeared in Albania last year. The weapons, which could be had for \$15 a year ago, now sell for \$100 to \$200 for a newer model.

"We are all preparing to fight, and we will go to battle as soon as we get the call from the UCK," said

one village elder, who produced a strategic map made by the guerrilla force.

In Kruma, a policeman said he had helped smuggle men and arms past Serbian army and police positions in Kosovo.

That confirms reports from Serbian officials, who say there have been numerous gunbattles on the frontier. They say they have blocked more than 135 attempted border crossings this year and seized large quantities of weapons.

Once in Kosovo, the UCK militants move from house to house, emerging at night to set up checkpoints and stage hit-and-run attacks on Serbian police. The group says it has killed nearly 30 Serbian policeman and "collaborators" since 1996.

Formal military experience in the UCK is rare except among the officers. A key leader, Adem Jashari, was killed along with most of his family during a Serbian police

raid in March. But UCK sources say central command is less important than popular support in a region where the ethnic Albanians have willing and able sympathizers.

Regrouping from last month's Serbian police offensive, the guerrillas inside Kosovo are becoming increasingly bold — some Western diplomats say rash.

With thousands of sympathetic villagers led by a few hundred regular UCK troops, the guerrillas appear to be digging in for a standoff in their besieged pocket in the Drenica region west of the Kosovo capital.

"They are provocative and sometimes try to draw the Serbian police into firefights," said one Western diplomat who travels frequently to Kosovo.

Their leaders in Albania, meanwhile, appear to revel in the attention and notoriety they are gaining, saying it has brought them increased financial donations.

Washington Times

April 8, 1998

Pg. 18

## Albanians reject offer of negotiation

By Guy Dinmore  
THE FINANCIAL TIMES

BELGRADE, Yugoslavia — Ethnic Albanian leaders in Kosovo yesterday rejected an offer to talk with Serbian President Milan Milutinovic, who flew to the trou-

bled province. Instead, they insisted on foreign mediation and withdrawal of special police forces.

"By behaving this way, the Albanian parties are unfortunately used as an alibi for further pressures on our country," Mr. Milutinovic said, referring to the threat of further sanctions hanging over Serbia.

Diplomats had placed little hope in Mr. Milutinovic's well publicized visit to Kosovo and said the Serbian president, a close ally of federal Yugoslav President Slob-

dan Milosevic, appeared intent on setting Belgrade on a collision course with the international community.

Serbia's parliament met yesterday to approve a government proposal to hold a referendum on April 23 that would ask voters throughout Serbia whether they approve of foreign involvement in talks on Kosovo's future.

"Anyone who knows the Serbian people knows the outcome already," Vojislav Seselj, leader of the extreme nationalist Radical Party, told parliament in a speech condemning foreign interference.

• Distributed by Scripps Howard.

European Stars &amp; Stripes

April 8, 1998

Pg. 1

## Accusers must weigh options

By Chuck Vinch  
Washington bureau

WASHINGTON — Report sexual harassment through your chain of command.

That's the standard advice for female servicemembers. But legal analysts say flaws in the military's system for handling such complaints make dealing with the chain of command a risky endeavor.

"It's sad to say, but I'd be doing a disservice to military women if I encouraged them to make sexual harassment complaints before considering all the very real consequences," said Susan Barnes, a Denver attorney who has been a long-

time legal advocate for servicewomen.

Barnes, who represents retired Sgt. Maj. Brenda Hoster in her ongoing court battle with former Sergeant Major of the Army Gene McKinney, said that while sensitivity to sexual harassment has increased, a military woman who makes a complaint is still "risking her career, plain and simple."

Pentagon officials declined to comment directly on Barnes' assertion. Instead, they offered statements that Defense Secretary William Cohen made March 14 on CNN.

"I have full confidence in our military and our justice system," Cohen said. "Our

policy ... is that there should be no harassment of any kind. Any such allegations will be seriously investigated and, if the facts warrant, prosecution brought."

Cohen re-emphasized that the military's policy on sexual harassment is one of "zero tolerance."

Kevin Barry, a retired Coast Guard officer who spent many years as a military trial judge and is now in private practice, agreed with Barnes.

"Historically, the lesson has been that women who make harassment complaints are branded as whiners who can't hack it in the military, and they're marked for the rest of

their careers," Barry said.

Barry said using the chain of command can be uncomfortable because the harassment often originates somewhere within that chain.

"That puts the command on the spot," he said. "A complaint can't be ignored. But, on the other hand, substantiated charges reflect badly on the command for having allowed conditions to develop in which the harassment could occur."

Other analysts said the message for military women sifting through the fallout from the McKinney case and other recent high-profile sexual misconduct scandals in the military is this: Tread carefully.

Whether to report harassment is "always a difficult decision," said Nancy Duff Campbell, co-president of the

National Women's Law Center, who has advised senior Pentagon legal officials on refining military sexual harassment regulations.

"You have to make a judgment not only on how to stop the harassment, but also on what impact the episode and your reporting of it will have on your career," Campbell said. "According to the military's own survey data, women don't have a lot of confidence that their reports will be taken seriously."

Hoster, a former public affairs aide to McKinney, claimed she approached two

people in her chain of command — Col. Robert Gaylord, now the Army's deputy chief of public affairs, and retired Sgt. Maj. Larry Whitley, formerly the service's senior enlisted public affairs adviser.

"She didn't get help from either of them," Barnes said. "They didn't want to deal with it."

Gaylord declined to comment. Whitley did not return a phone message.

From a practical standpoint, Campbell urged women who think they are the victims of sexual harassment to first try to resolve the situation infor-

mally.

"Of course, if it's egregious behavior, it should be reported immediately," she said. "In less serious situations, try to make the man understand that you want the behavior to stop — but make clear that if it doesn't stop, neither will you."

The next step — contacting the chain of command and making a formal report — should be considered only after making a "personal climate assessment" of the command, Campbell said.

"The unfortunate reality is that these kinds of complaints often are not welcome at the

top," Barnes said. "In some commands, sexual harassment is taken seriously, and in others it's not. Women can usually figure out pretty easily how receptive their own chain of command will be."

Barnes also urged any woman who is thinking about making a complaint to carefully study the sweeping sexual harassment reporting guidelines that took effect several years ago. Those guidelines lay out clear-cut procedures and timelines that the chain of command must follow.

## Independent complaint process could be answer

European Stars & Stripes April 8, 1998 Pg. 1

By Chuck Vinch  
Washington bureau

WASHINGTON — The Defense Department could go a long way toward easing sexual harassment problems in the military by creating a more independent process for handling such complaints, legal and personnel experts say.

Most harassment complaints in the private sector are handled administratively in civil court, and government civilians have an independent body in the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

In comparison, the military "automatically criminalizes" such complaints, said Susan Barnes, the Denver attorney who represents retired Sgt. Maj. Brenda Hoster in her legal fight with former Sergeant

Major of the Army Gene McKinney.

That means, for example, that McKinney could have faced 55 years in prison if he had been convicted on all 19 counts against him. None of the charges probably would have brought much more than a fine in civil court.

"Even McKinney's detractors would have to admit that 55 years is totally inappropriate," said Kevin Barry, a retired Coast Guard officer who served for many years as a military trial judge and now is in private practice.

"But there's just no venue to handle it as a civil matter. The system is filled with quirks like that, which create all kinds of problems in sexual harassment and misconduct cases."

In many cases, women don't report harassment because they

themselves feel that the penalty far exceeds what they think is fair, said Nancy Duff Campbell, co-president of the National Women's Law Center.

"Most women don't want penalties assessed — they just want the harassment to stop," Campbell said.

The center has submitted to senior Pentagon legal officials a proposal to revamp the reporting system. Initial reports would still go to the chain of command, but then the complaint would be handled by an independent board, which would then report back through the chain.

"It would be very similar to the EEOC for civilians in the federal government," Campbell said. "The ultimate responsibility remains within the chain of command, but this would provide an independent as-

essment."

The center's proposal was forwarded last August to the Pentagon general counsel's office, which is heading one of three working groups set up by Defense Secretary William Cohen in June.

The general counsel's working group has been charged with reviewing current guidelines on the way the military handles disciplinary matters related to adultery and sexual harassment issues, and proposing changes to the Manual for Courts-Martial and the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

A Pentagon official said the group has been soliciting input from a variety of sources, one of which is the center. The group is expected to complete its report later this spring.

Dallas Morning News

April 8, 1998

Pg. 1

## Rebels threaten elections in Bogota

*Colombian officials say they are ill-prepared for a possible conflict*

By Tod Robberson  
The Dallas Morning News

BOGOTA, Colombia - Former Colombian army intelligence officer Jose Luis Cadena Montenegro pointed eastward from his downtown Bogota office to explain why the nation's deteriorating security situation is generating so much concern in Washington these

days.

"See those mountains over there?" he said, motioning toward a set of heavily wooded slopes barely a mile away. "The guerrillas are right on the other side."

Then he pointed in rapid succession to the north, west and south, listing off the names of nearby towns, parks and busy highways on the outskirts

of the Colombian capital. "And they're there, and there and there," he said.

Mr. Cadena, a retired major and 23-year veteran of the army, is far from alone in offering a bleak assessment. According to senior Colombian military commanders and Clinton administration officials, Colombia is facing an unprecedented onslaught by up to

20,000 heavily armed leftist guerrillas in the leadup to presidential elections next month.

"The guerrillas are intent on knocking off a democratically elected government," an informed diplomatic source said.

Officials say the rebels have virtually surrounded the Colombian capital and are positioned to block virtually every major highway out of the city. They have so heavily infiltrated the nation's third-largest city, Cali, that the U.S. State Department is telling Americans to get out altogether.

And there is little that the

Colombian military has been able to do about it, the officials say, citing poorly trained and ill-equipped forces, underfunding, mismanagement and rapidly diminishing troop morale as only some of the myriad problems confronting the nation's 120,000 men and women in uniform.

"Can you believe that the army has only 17 helicopters to control this entire country?" the armed forces commander, Gen. Manuel Jose Bonett, said.

Though he insisted he is not appealing for U.S. military aid, Gen. Bonett warned that U.S. strategic and economic interests are being threatened by the rebels, while the U.S. response so far has been minimal.

"In Vietnam, you had 600,000 men, and Vietnam is only one-fifth the size of Colombia," he said. "In El Salvador, which is one-fiftieth the size of Colombia, the United States had many more troops and helicopters than what it has in Colombia."

"I believe that the United States has abandoned us, and it's very bad to abandon friends," Gen. Bonett said.

Although there is talk in Washington of sending sophisticated Cobra and Blackhawk helicopters to assist Colombian forces in counterinsurgency and counternarcotics operations, the Clinton administration has balked at the high purchase, maintenance and training costs associated with such equipment.

Republicans on Capitol Hill charged last week that the administration's slow response in sending aid to Colombia is hampering the war on drugs, while Colombian military officials warn that the guerrillas are rapidly gaining a tactical advantage.

"This is one of the best-financed and sophisticated guerrilla movements in the world," the Colombian National Police commander, Gen. Rosso Jose Serrano, said at a hearing on Capitol Hill last week.

The rebels' ranks, which last year were estimated at around 15,000, now have swollen to as many as 20,000 fighters, Gen. Serrano said.

"They have modern arms. We had information that they are working to obtain missiles,

clandestinely. They have M-60s, 50-caliber [guns], AK-47s. They have rockets. This is a guerrilla force that is extremely well-armed [and] financed by money from narcotics trafficking," he added.

While cringing at comparisons to Vietnam and El Salvador, U.S. officials say they want to take immediate steps to raise the level of military aid and counterinsurgency training.

"It may mean more U.S. military personnel on the ground," an informed diplomatic source said, referring to Clinton administration efforts to send more U.S. trainers to Colombia. "Clearly it is not in our interest to let it keep going in this direction."

The urgent scope of Colombia's security problem was never more obvious, officials say, than two weeks ago, when scores of guerrillas from the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia, the nation's largest rebel group, seized a four-lane highway less than 30 miles southeast of Bogota. For seven hours, they held up more than 500 cars and detained an estimated 2,000 people before the army arrived.

Before departing, the rebels took four Americans and about 25 Colombians hostage. One of the Americans was able to escape late last week. But the other three - including a Houston resident, Todd Marks - remain in captivity.

"We're talking about high mountain terrain. We don't have the helicopters, and all of our movements have to be on foot," Gen. Bonett said in explaining the army's response.

"You can imagine how the highways are in the mountains, the confusion that there is, children crying. The army can't just go there with guns blazing and killing everyone in site. It's impossible, and because of that, civilians were taken away," he said.

When the army finally arrived, the general added, it managed to kill 17 fleeing guerrillas.

With the army unable or unwilling to counterattack on a rural highway, Mr. Cadena, the former army intelligence officer, questioned how it would respond to a guerrilla attack on the capital.

"Undoubtedly, there is fear of the guerrillas getting closer to the city. They are on all four sides of the capital," he said. "There's concern because you can't drive 20 minutes outside Bogota without the risk of encountering a guerrilla roadblock."

As May 31 presidential elections approach, the U.S. Embassy is warning Americans to stay off most highways around the capital. During congressional elections last month and municipal elections in October, rebels staged a nationwide campaign of kidnappings and death threats to keep voters away from the polls. Now they have added Americans to their list of potential targets.

On Monday, the private Free Country Foundation issued a list of highways where motorists might encounter guerrilla roadblocks during Holy Week travel this week. The list included almost every major artery leading outside Bogota.

Meanwhile, over the last week, American oil companies have placed their personnel on alert inside the Colombian capital because of rumored threats by the rebels to kidnap a prominent American in the same hillside neighborhood where U.S. Ambassador Curtis Kamman lives.

Gen. Bonett acknowledged that his options to fend off the rebels are limited.

"One thing is certain: The armed forces of Colombia need more strength," he said. "First, we lack mobility on the rivers. Second, we lack mobility in the

air, and third, we are failing to quickly boost our combat power, our manpower, that is, our human potential."

Although the armed forces number less than 120,000 men and women, Gen. Bonett said only around 40,000 troops are trained and equipped for combat.

Mr. Cadena, who is finishing a book-length study of weaknesses in the armed forces, said the actual number of combat-ready troops is closer to 20,000.

"That leaves you with a guerrilla-to-soldier fighting ratio of 1 to 1," he said. U.S. military analysts say the minimum ratio necessary to fight a guerrilla war is around 10 soldiers for every insurgent.

Mr. Cadena noted that because the long-standing U.S. emphasis has been on fighting drug traffickers in Colombia, U.S. aid has tended to focus on bolstering the 90,000-member Colombian National Police, while the army has languished under U.S. restrictions blocking aid to units linked to human-rights abuses.

The result has been to reverse the traditional roles performed by the police and army.

"We have troops on the streets of Bogota conducting foot patrols. They shouldn't be there. That's a police job, not an army job," he said. "There are thousands of troops doing things that have nothing to do with their mission, like guarding farms and ranches, protecting oil pipelines and patrolling banana plantations. Isn't this what the police are for?"

Washington Post April 8, 1998 Pg. 21

## In the Loop

By Al Kamen

### Adm. Pease and Gen. Dynamics

Adm. Kendall Pease, the Navy's chief information officer, is leaving the Navy after 35 years, including four as an undergraduate at the U.S. Na-

val Academy. Pease is going private sector next month as vice president for communications of General Dynamics Corp., conveniently headquartered in Falls Church.

Rear Adm. Tom Jurkowski, who's been at the Naval Academy as head public affairs officer for four years, is moving over to replace Pease.

Hezbollah said it would seek Lebanese parliamentary approval for granting amnesty to low-level members of a militia that helps Israel hold a southern security zone. Israel has proposed a pullout, but Lebanon and Syria have balked. An Israeli official called the plan "psychological warfare."

Wall Street  
Journal  
April 8, 1998  
Pg. 1



# India warns it won't back off in missile race with Pakistan

Washington  
Times  
April 8, 1998  
Pg. 13

By Rahul Bedi  
LONDON DAILY TELEGRAPH

NEW DELHI — India says it will take "resolute steps" to meet any threat from a new midrange Pakistani missile, successfully test-fired on Monday and capable of penetrating deep inside Indian territory.

"We are prepared to deal with anything Pakistan plans to do," said George Fernandes, India's defense minister, in response to the test-firing of the missile, which has a range of 950 miles.

He said that India's missile program would continue, and that its Prithvi surface-to-surface missile was capable of reaching anywhere in Pakistan.

But he added, "I do not think we are close to a warlike situation, as test-firing and missile production are not the same thing."

Indian newspapers reacted angrily to Pakistan's test of the Ghauri missile, which is easily capable of striking Delhi, and demanded that India must counter Pakistani "provocation."

"Pakistan appears to have deliberately thrown down the gauntlet," the Times of India said.

"The government credibility on security issues is at stake and the nation will be watching if they display any more spine than earlier governments." It said New Delhi should order a new test of its long-range Agni missile "at the earliest possible date."

The paper said the surface-to-surface Ghauri missile had "profound symbolism" because it was named after a medieval Afghan king who defeated the Hindu ruler of New Delhi.

K. Subrahmanyam, a leading Indian defense analyst, said the country had to "expedite" the development of Agni. The nuclear-capable missile was mothballed after its third test in February 1994 amid Western pressure. "We must tell the Americans to shut up; we will do what we have to do for our security," Mr. Subrahmanyam said.

"The Americans have not been able to stop proliferation. This is a Chinese missile on Pakistani soil."

Mr. Fernandes also accused China of supplying missile technology to Pakistan in violation of

international agreements, such as the American-sponsored Missile Technology Control Regime.

America has expressed "regret" at Pakistan's missile test and urged both countries to exercise restraint in preventing an arms buildup.

The extended range of Pakistan's new missile makes major cities, such as Calcutta in the east and Madras in the south, vulnerable targets, Indian military officials and analysts say.

India and Pakistan have been to war three times since independence in 1947. Diplomatic relations remain strained over the disputed principality of Kashmir, where the neighboring armies ex-

change artillery and small arms fire every day.

Over the past year, India has often said it would relaunch Agni, which needs at least six more tests to achieve its optimum range of 1,560 miles.

India's all-party Parliamentary Standing Committee on Defense had also urged the government to build and deploy Agni swiftly to meet the changing security situation in the region.

"India has no option but to continue to develop its missile capabilities for deterrence against the adventurist intentions of a hostile country," said its report.

Richmond Times-Dispatch

Apr. 8, 1998 Pg. 4

## French arms, genocide in Rwanda tied

THE ASSOCIATED PRESS

PARIS — An expert on Rwanda told a French parliamentary inquiry yesterday that Hutu assassins used French-supplied rockets to kill Rwanda's president, which set off the 1994 genocide of a half-million Rwandans.

A former French official has contended the rockets came from U.S. stockpiles — an allegation Washington has denied.

The testimony came as the French parliamentary probe into foreign military operations in Rwanda from 1990-94 picked up steam. Two former French prime ministers are scheduled to appear, and investigators have requested an appearance by U.N. Secretary-General Kofi Annan.

The inquiry began late last month after news reports accused the French of arming and supporting Rwanda's Hutu-led regime, even while it was carrying out the genocide of mostly ethnic Tutsis.

In response to the reports, some French officials allege that Paris is

the victim of a U.S. push to undermine France's traditional influence in Africa.

A Belgian researcher at the University of Antwerp, Filip Reyntjens, told the lawmakers yesterday he has gathered reports from several sources that the rockets that downed the plane of Rwandan President Juvenal Habyarimana on April 6, 1994, came from French stockpiles.

France seized the Soviet-made rockets from Iraq during the 1991 Gulf War, and they were somehow passed on to the Rwandan army, which was led by pro-French regime, Reyntjens said.

Members of Rwanda's Hutu-dominated military have been accused of killing Habyarimana, who had reached a peace accord with the Tutsis. The military, however, blamed Tutsis for downing the plane, and allegedly launched the genocide in revenge.

Reyntjens said he had no documents to prove his claim but has numerous sources corroborating it.

The conservative development minister in 1994, Bernard Debre, said Monday the SAM-16 missiles probably were seized by U.S. troops during the Gulf War and passed to the Ugandans. The weapons were then allegedly passed to Tutsi rebels, who eventually toppled the Hutu regime.

Washington quickly denied the claim.

# France's Chirac Urges Bosnians To 'Build Model Country'

New York Times  
April 8, 1998

By Agence France-Press

SARAJEVO - French President Jacques Chirac walked the war-scarred streets of Sarajevo on Tuesday and challenged Bosnia's youth to respect ethnic diversity and "build a model country" within Europe.

"You aspire to join tomorrow the great European family, because this family is yours, as it is that of all the peoples of the former Yugoslavia," Chirac told Moslem, Serbs and Croat students in a speech at the national theater.

He encouraged Bosnians "to build a model country, one in which peoples must learn to live together, with respect for their differences."

Chirac arrived Monday for a 24-hour visit, the first by a French president since the 45-month war ended in December 1995 with the signing of the Dayton peace accords in his Paris residence.

Late on Tuesday he was in Mostar, a southern city still bitterly divided between Moslem and Croats, visiting some

of the 3,500 French troops in Bosnia with the NATO-led peacekeeping Stabilization Force (SFOR).

There he condemned "doctrines of another age: intolerance, ethnic hatred and racism," and reaffirmed France's place "on the front lines" to find a political solution to Bosnia's tensions.

He also pledged French support for rebuilding Mostar's historic 16th century arched bridge, a legacy of the Ottoman Empire. Its destruction by Croat shelling in November 1993 remains a symbol of the war's savagery.

Chirac began Tuesday by meeting President Alija Izetbegovic and the Serb and Croat members of Bosnia's collective presidency, Momcilo Krajisnik and Kresimir Zubak, separately and then together.

"We had discussions that were truly very amiable," Chirac told reporters. "Everyone knows the problems that Bosnia-Herzegovina faces, and everyone hopes it can

overcome them."

Izetbegovic, a Moslem who first declared Bosnia's independence from Yugoslavia, thanked Chirac "for France's immense contribution to peace in Bosnia."

On the sun-drenched Safajevo streets, Chirac walked the Vrbanja bridge over the Miljacka River, where two French UN peacekeepers died in a May 1995 confrontation with Serbs in the besieged city.

He stood in silence before a memorial plaque, then mingled with a handful of Sarajevo bystanders -- one of whom, Midhat Avdibegovic, kissed the president on both cheeks, saying "Merci, merci beaucoup."

"If it had not been for Mr. Chirac, we would not have had peace," Avdibegovic told AFP afterwards.

Bosnians regard Chirac as having been more willing than his predecessor, Francois Mitterrand, to use NATO firepower to punish Serb forces for the siege of Sarajevo and the

brutal "ethnic cleansing" of Moslem areas.

Sarajevans were on holiday Tuesday for the Moslem festival of Eid al-Adha, rendering the city quieter than usual. But everywhere the president could see vestiges of war.

Just by the Vrbanja bridge -- where the first Sarajevo to die in the war was also shot and killed six years ago -- was a gutted office block, its front lawn cordoned off by yellow tape used to demark mine fields.

In the central Markale market, he could see the impact points -- now painted blood red -- of Serb mortar shells that killed 68 and 41 civilians in attacks in February 1994 and August 1995 that shocked the world.

Chirac's trip also saw the signing of three protocols, worth 43 million French francs (seven million dollars), for the printing of Bosnia's new currency, rebuilding the national electricity network, and to set up bakeries.

Richmond Times-Dispatch  
April 8, 1998  
Pg. 4

## Treaty is urged on Senate

*Nuclear test ban  
is called crucial*

THE ASSOCIATED PRESS

WASHINGTON — The Clinton administration yesterday urged the Senate to ratify a treaty banning all nuclear weapons tests.

The pitch by senior administration officials was aimed at Sen. Jesse Helms, R-N.C., the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Commit-

tee, who has declined to hold hearings.

In January, Helms wrote President Clinton that a pact to expand NATO and several other agreements had highest priority. He said the test ban treaty had no chance of entering into force for at least a decade.

Declaring the United States can rely on simulated tests for the American nuclear program, Undersecretary of State John Holum said the Senate has "a historic opportunity" to make it harder for non-nuclear nations to develop the weapons.

"Without testing, it's an insurmountable barrier," Holum told reporters at the State Department.

Even with several treaties to cut nuclear and chemical weapons arsenals, the threat of an attack is graver today because weapons are cheaper to make and are more portable, Deputy Secretary Strobe Talbott said.

The Comprehensive Test Ban treaty has been signed by 149 countries and ratified by 13. The latest were Britain and France, the first nuclear powers to ratify the ban on all nuclear weapons test explosions.

For the treaty to take force, 44 countries identified as having a nuclear capability must ratify it. The United States has not, while three of

the countries, India, Pakistan and North Korea, have not even signed the accord.

India, which exploded a nuclear device that it said was for peaceful purposes in 1974, has refused to sign, arguing the treaty should have a formula for disarming nuclear nations like the United States.

Pakistan on Monday successfully tested a medium-range missile that is capable of reaching deep within India. Pakistan has said it would not sign the treaty unless India did.

North Korea, meanwhile, froze its nuclear weapons program in 1994 in exchange for other sources of energy from the United States, South Korea and Japan.

If there is delay past the fall, when the Senate is due to recess for the year, the United States may be unable to participate in a conference in the fall of 1999 that would consider ways to prod India, Pakistan and North Korea into signing the treaty, Holum said.

Adopting a worldwide ban on nuclear weapons tests would be difficult if India, Pakistan and North Korea refuse to ratify the treaty. However, the conference in 1999 could decide other nations should commit themselves not to conduct nuclear tests.



# Marching Toward Joint Vision 2010

*Interview With General Joseph W. Ralston, USAF,  
Vice Chairman Of The Joint Chiefs Of Staff*

By John G. Roos &  
Glenn W. Goodman

*Late on a Friday afternoon in early March after he returned from his third White House meeting of the day, General Ralston sat down to field questions from AFJ's editors.*

**A day in the life:** "There is a certain uniqueness about the Vice Chairman's job. I know of no other military position that does the following things. It's really a three-part job. Part one is the day-to-day things that only the Joint Staff can do—moving ships and airplanes around, real-world deployments. The Chairman [Army General Henry H. Shelton] and I both spend a lot of time with those decisions. I probably spend 60 percent of my time on the real-world crises -- what we should do in regard to the Serb actions in Kosovo; the ongoing Iraq crisis; North Korea also came up today. When the Chairman is overseas, I can't just take over these issues suddenly. We've got to have continuity, so I have to work these issues on a day-to-day basis, and that's my primary responsibility.

"I spend a lot of time in the interagency arena, contributing to foreign policy decisions—should we use force and, if so, what kind of force. That's what the three White House meetings were about today. The principals have to advise the President -- the principals being the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, and the President's National Security Advisor. In order to focus the issues for their consideration, we have a committee of their deputies that meets regularly. So I spend a lot of time on the real-world geopolitical situation.

"The third piece of the Vice Chairman's job concerns making decisions on recommendations for modernizing our forces [by the Joint Require-

ments Oversight Council, or JROC, made up of Ralston and the services' vice chiefs].

"Now, I will assert to you that there is no other job in the military that has responsibility in all three of those arenas. And my perspective in each of them is heavily influenced by what's been occurring in the other two. For example, when I'm making a decision about force modernization, I can't ignore the real world -- moving aircraft carriers, moving airplanes, how are we going to backfill this and that -- and the readiness implications of all that. Modernization decisions are also influenced by our National Military Strategy -- our need to shape the security environment, respond to crises, and stay engaged with our friends and allies around the world—and how we can best execute it.

"So those other two areas have a very big impact on what we do in terms of modernization and vice versa. We can't just focus on day-to-day readiness and the shaping aspect. If we did that exclusively, we would ignore modernization -- we wouldn't worry about the future, we'd worry solely about today."

**Reconciling the independent National Defense Panel's recommendations with DOD's Quadrennial Defense Review:** "I think the National Defense Panel validated much of the QDR, and there was a lot of agreement between them. Yes, there are differences. The NDP did take a longer-term view [out to 2020]. There's nothing wrong with that, except we are confronted with the day-to-day realities.

"The Vice Chairman's job forces me to focus on all three of those areas of responsibility -- day-to-day readiness, the world geopolitical situation, and force modernization -- at the same time. And I believe that the QDR put the appropriate emphasis on shaping our day-to-day exercising overseas, our forward deployments, and forward presence. It put the

appropriate emphasis on responding, which includes the full range of missions that we can expect to confront, whether it's nuclear deterrence, two major theater wars, smaller-scale contingencies like Bosnia, or humanitarian relief situations like we have going on in Kenya today because of the floods there. Finally, we have to prepare now for the future and have to do a better job in our modernization. We told Congress in the QDR what we were going to do, in terms of increasing the resources spent on modernization, and when the 1999 President's budget request went forward, we did exactly that. So I think we have made good on our commitments that we had in the QDR.

"The NDP didn't concentrate as much on the near term. I have to worry about the near term, because we have to meet those challenges today. There's no argument about the need for us to launch a transformation strategy to enable us to meet the security challenges in 2010 to 2020. But, at the end of the day, we have to balance that with our budget, and I think we have a better balance in the QDR than what the NDP calls for."

**The state of "jointness" and whether another set of congressional reforms is needed:** "I have to look back at where we were 12 years ago at the time the Goldwater-Nichols Act was passed versus where we are today. It is a completely different world, a completely different situation in our services. The level of jointness that we have today -- the joint war-fighting arrangements we have—are light years ahead of where we were 12 years ago. I personally believe that we have a very good plan and that we do not need additional legislation to keep the vector going in the right direction. We are marching toward Joint Vision 2010, we are marching toward joint experimentation.

"I've been asked by congressmen if we need additional

legislation. My answer to that question has been 'no.' I think the legislation that we have on the books now is adequate for what we need to do. We're moving in the right direction. I think we've made enormous strides, enormous progress. Clearly, we can always do more, and we are trying to do more.

**Congressional proposal to establish a joint experimentation command:** "There is great merit in experimentation. All the services are doing it. I think there is great merit in having a joint force that does experimentation. I would not advocate a standing joint force command to do that, but instead I would depend on USA-COM [US Atlantic Command, which already conducts joint-service exercises]. They are certainly up to the task of doing that.

"I would also caution that you'll never be able to have an experiment that covers the entire world and the full range of potential missions. When you have an experiment, by virtue of it being controllable, it has to be focused on a particular area. I don't know of any experiment that can cover nuclear deterrence, two major theater wars, smaller-scale contingencies, and humanitarian disaster relief all at the same time. And if I focus on only one of them, such as smaller-scale contingencies, I might be forced into making some decisions on the basis of that experiment. But you can't look at it in isolation. You would have to say, 'Maybe I could design a better force for smaller-scale contingencies, but how would that serve me in nuclear deterrence, or in two major theater wars?'"

**Changes to the JROC:** "I have seen the JROC evolve over time. My predecessors—General Herres, Admiral Jeremiah, and Admiral Owens -- each took it to a higher level of effectiveness in addressing military requirements from a joint perspective and making integrated program and budget recommendations affecting the services' warfare systems. We have made some modifications to make it even more effective. For example, we have formed the JROC Review Board [JRB], which is made up of a two-star from each of the services and

chaired by the J-8 [the Joint Staff's Director for Force Structure, Resources & Assessment]. This mirrors what we have had for years on the operational side of the house. When the Joint Chiefs go to the 'tank' to meet, the issues to be decided don't go straight from the action officer to the Chiefs. The operations deputies frame the issues. They work what they can at their level, they get the issues focused, and then the Chiefs come in and make a decision.

That's what we now do on the JROC side of the house. The Joint Staff action officers or the Joint Warfighting Capabilities Assessment teams work the issues and bring them up through the JRB, which gives the services an opportunity at the general officer/flag officer level to bring some mature leadership to bear to focus each issue, and then the JROC comes in and decides what recommendations will be made to the Chairman and the Secretary of Defense.

We've made a lot of tough calls. There's hardly a set of requirements that come through the JROC that aren't modified as a result of bringing in the mature leadership from the different perspectives."

**Joint Staff personnel reductions:** "In order to set an example, we reduced the Joint Staff by about 12 percent by eliminating slots, transferring personnel, and considering positions for possible contracting. We transferred many activities that previously reported to the JCS Chairman, such as the Joint Communications Support Element at MacDill AFB, FL, which now reports to USA-COM like other continental US-based forces. The overall reduction in personnel on the Joint Staff and in JCS activities was nearly 30 percent, from 2,522 to 1,770."

**PERSTEMPO/OPTEMPO yardsticks:** "Each of the services has now developed their own new metrics for tracking PERSTEMPO [personnel tempo, or time spent away from home station on temporary deployments] and OPTEMPO [unit operating tempo, or time away] that the Joint Staff monitors from a readiness perspective. We pushed hard to get those yardsticks, and it has

taken a while to establish them.

For example, the Army tracks the length of time its units are away from home and has a goal that they not be deployed more than 120 days a year. If they exceed that, they fall under a special oversight mechanism. The Air Force tracks the data by weapon system and by skill specialty. So the services now have good data that they can bring to the Joint Staff, and we can then go to the CinCs [theater commander-in-chief] and discuss reducing the tasking of particular types of units. I think the system is working much better now and gives the services much better visibility [of units needing relief]."

**Goals for his second term:** "I want to make sure that we do the best job that we can in explaining to Congress our day-to-day PERSTEMPO/OPTEMPO readiness issues, so we en-

sure that we adequately fund those areas. I want us to do the best we can in articulating the potential military contribution to foreign policy issues, so our political decisionmakers understand what our military forces can do and can't do and what the costs of military operations are in terms of PERSTEMPO, OPTEMPO, dollars, and lives. On the modernization side, I hope that we can move toward Joint Vision 2010, that we continue the advances that have been made across the board in terms of our joint requirements, and that we can meet the critical modernization needs that we have."

**Key challenges:** "We certainly face difficult modernization challenges in Theater Missile Defense and National Missile Defense. Those are hard technical problems, and we have to try to find the right balance. We want to fund them

adequately so we can field the systems that our forces need, but we've got to have good technical solutions. You can't just throw money at the problem. So that requires us to make tough judgmental calls.

"Dealing with the threat of weapons of mass destruction is a difficult problem geopolitically as well as on the technical side. We added a billion dollars to our 1999 budget request for counterproliferation efforts, both active and passive measures.

"We have a lot of work to do to ensure that our arms control agreements come to fruition. We really need the Russians to ratify START II, so that we can make the resulting force structure adjustments. I hate for either nation to put more resources into nuclear weapons than what is necessary."

Atlanta Journal-Constitution April 8, 1998 Pg. 3

## Submarine to be named for Carter

By Elizabeth Kurylo, The Atlanta Journal-Constitution

The Navy's newest nuclear submarine will be named after former President Jimmy Carter. Navy Secretary John Dalton is expected to announce the decision today.

Carter said he learned about the decision in January when he visited President Clinton in the White House.

"While I was in the Oval Office, he told me that he and the secretary of the Navy had decided that they wanted to name one of the Seawolf-class submarines for me. Obviously, I'm honored," Carter said in an interview before he left last week for Africa.

"My last assignment in the nuclear Navy under Admiral [Hyman] Rickover was to help prepare the U.S.S. Seawolf for service," Carter said. "So, since my service was in the submarine force, and since my career was Navy, and since I have been president and commander in chief of the Navy, and the Army and Air Force, I was very honored."

Carter said he is hoping to attend a naming ceremony later this month at the Pentagon. The submarine, the third and final

in the Seawolf class, is still being built.

A 1946 Naval Academy graduate, Carter served in the Atlantic and Pacific submarine fleets. He is the only president who qualified to serve on a submarine, according to the Navy.

"He has distinguished himself by a lifetime of public service and has long ties to the Navy and the submarine force," a Navy statement said. "President Carter's statesmanship, philanthropy and sense of humanity have made him one of the most influential Americans of the late 20th century."

Carter resigned his naval commission after seven years when his father died.

He returned home to Georgia to run the family's Plains farm and a farm supply company. He served as a state senator, was elected governor in 1970 and president in 1976.

The decision to name a submarine after Carter "is a long overdue tribute," said Douglas Brinkley, a historian whose book on Carter's active post-presidency will be published next month. "The Navy means a lot to him. This is a

very befitting honor," said Brinkley.

The Seawolf is the quietest, fastest and most complex submarine ever built.

The first boat in the class was named USS Seawolf, for a fish, and the second was named for the state of Connecticut.

The third Seawolf, which is being built at Electric Boat shipyards in Groton, Conn., and Quonset Point, R.I., is about 35 percent complete.

Carter said he "never dreamed" a submarine would be named for him. "When I was in the submarine force at the beginning, all submarines were named after fish, and I was on the U.S.S. Pomfret," Carter said.

The "Jimmy Carter" will be armed with Tomahawk cruise missiles. It will also carry the "Mark 48" advanced capability torpedo, the Navy said. "Jimmy Carter" will be eminently capable of establishing and maintaining battle space dominance," the Navy said. "Jimmy Carter" will be able to safely conduct deep-strike missions while submerged far off an enemy's coast."

## The Trouble With 'Don't Ask, Don't Tell'

New York Times

April 8, 1998

A new Defense Department draft report shows that the number of homosexuals being forced out of the military under the "Don't ask, don't tell, don't pursue" policy is 67 percent higher than when the policy was adopted in 1993. The report is silent on what might be causing this surprising result. Yet the Pentagon seems resistant to examining the most disturbing and obvious possibility, which is that base and unit commanders are subverting a policy that was intended to stop witch hunts and to insure some measure of privacy for gay men and women in the ranks.

The Pentagon spin is that service members are voluntarily declaring themselves gay to get out of the military. But if that were true, wouldn't discharge numbers have stayed roughly the same from year to year?

The report should cause Defense Secretary William Cohen to worry that commanders are not being adequately trained on the purpose of the policy or the appropriate limits on investigations. At the same time, the nominal policy may be causing homosexuals to believe that they need not remain as vigilantly closeted as they were before. In any event, the promise of greater tolerance that was supposed to follow President Clinton's declaration of this new policy is turning out to be unfounded.

Military guidelines say that investigations cannot be based on mere suspicion or rumor. Associational behavior such as going to gay bars or reading homosexual books is not to be used as evidence of homosexual conduct. Yet there continue to be cases where service members are directly asked about their sexual orientation. Reliance on anonymous reports is not uncommon.

In some egregious situations, individuals who complained about anti-gay harassment were then investigated for being gay. The decision to begin an investigation is left to the commanding officer. Yet some commanders are inadequately versed on the guidelines, according to the report.

At a minimum, better training has to be put in place. The report also recommends that commanders consult with legal officials before initiating investigations. But these improvements will not cure the injustice inherent in a military that is allowed to drum effective people out for no reason other than homosexuality. Mr. Clinton erred in 1993 when he let Gen. Colin Powell and others bully him into backing away from his original intention to ban discrimination against homosexuals in the military. This report provides a measure of that error.

Washington Post

April 8, 1998

Pg. 22

### For the Record

From a news briefing yesterday by Defense Department spokesman Kenneth Bacon:

Q: If 10 were a perfect number, how would you rate the success of the "don't ask, don't tell" policy? We both know how it was born in such controversy, but [has it] been accepted? [Is it] working? What kind of a grade would you give it?

Mr. Bacon: I am not sure I am qualified to be the grader in this case. I think it would be more appropriate to ask that question of somebody who spent more time on the policy than I.

But based on my personal observation and on fairly extensive travel around the country and around the world talking with commanders and with soldiers, sailors, airmen and Marines, I'd say that the policy

gets a fairly high grade, probably a nine. And the reason I say that is that this never comes up in the course of discussions that I have witnessed between commanders or enlisted people and the secretary of Defense or other officials with whom I have traveled.

Everybody realizes that this is a difficult issue and that this policy attempts to balance two different equities. And I think it is clear . . . that the policy is

working.

Q: One last pass on that. . . Is it your sense that the same acceptance is evident in Congress and the retired military community?

A: I didn't say that. That's not what you asked me.

Q: I know. I said do you think that that's been accepted?

A: I can't speak for either of those groups. They'll have to speak for themselves.

USA Today

April 8, 1998

### Our View

## Congress keeps vote-getting bases

What's wrong with this picture?

By 2003, the U.S. Navy will have 46% fewer ships than it had in 1989, but it will be paying to maintain 82% of its Cold War piers and support facilities.

The Army's need for classroom training will be down 43%, but your taxes will be keeping up 93% of the old classrooms at bases scattered artfully from coast to coast.

The Air Force will have cut its small-plane fleet by more than half - 53% - but its budget will be stretched to keep excess ground facilities ready for planes that never come.

More Pentagon waste? Not really; more congressional politics, using the defense budget as a local jobs program.

While budget pressures force the military to delay development of new defense systems and replacement of old weapons, Congress is dragging its heels on the closure and consolidation of unneeded facilities.

That means money is drained from defense priorities into what's little more than political pork: payrolls and service contracts that contribute little, if anything, to the nation's security but a lot to any congressman's chances for re-election.

Defense Secretary William Cohen knows all about it. As a member of Congress in the '70s, protecting the parochial interests of his Maine constituency, he was a leader in writing the laws that now make it extremely difficult for him to close an unneeded

base without Congress' permission.

Now that Cohen is on the other side, circumstances have changed.

Bipartisan agreement a decade ago launched a series of special base-closing commissions designed to take most of the heat for doing what needs to be done. They will have saved \$25 billion by 2003.

Even in the \$265 billion world of annual defense budgets, that's real money, particularly when overall defense spending is being kept flat.

And not operating the closed facilities will save another \$5.6 billion every year thereafter.

But Congress rejected Cohen's request last year for two more rounds of base closing. A second bid last week also is getting a chilly reception, even from members who love to posture about pursuing government efficiency and taxpayer savings.

Unfortunately, the Clinton administration brought part of the problem on itself. Its sudden zeal for privatization of aircraft maintenance in order to keep jobs in electorally potent California and Texas in the last round was a serious mistake. Critics who may have partisan or parochial reasons for wanting to derail base closings now can cloak themselves in pious complaints that the administration politicized the process.

But that's no excuse for continuing the waste of taxpayers' money on unneeded facilities. Language in the base-closing bill rejected last year would have prevented a repetition of the administration's gamesmanship. And the new request would delay the next round until 2001, when Clinton is out of office.

Responsible stewardship of the public purse demands that

Congress approve more base closings. Otherwise, Cohen will be justified in starting the tortuous process of unilateral closures or mothballing of bases in order to save the money for real defense needs.

USA Today April 8, 1998

## Opposing View

### President has to lead way

By Curt Weldon

When Congress created the Commission on Base Realignment and Closure in 1988, it went to great lengths to remove politics from the process of downsizing.

Congress accepted the first three rounds of base closings, despite the recognition that this action would put tens of thousands of people out of work. No region was safe, including my congressional district. We lost more than 13,000 jobs when the Philadelphia Navy Yard was recommended for closure.

Then a fourth round of base closings was recommended, and something different happened. In 1995, President Clinton blocked the closing of two bases that had been recommended for closure by the non-political base closing commission. These bases were located in California and Texas, states that were key to President Clinton's re-election campaign. What had been a non-political process was poisoned to further his re-election goal.

While many members of Congress agree that additional closures are needed, we feel fundamentally betrayed by the president. Before Congress will approve more closures, the president needs to demonstrate his commitment to cutting costs

by reversing his politically motivated re-election decision, a decision that the General Accounting Office has estimated will cost American taxpayers more than \$1 billion over four years. Congress needs assurances from this administration that another round of base closing will not be politicized.

Additionally, President Clinton should look at his own actions and their impact upon the defense budget. In the past seven years, we have deployed our troops overseas on 25 separate occasions. In the previous 40 years, we deployed our troops only 10 times. The president's use of our military as the world's police force is clearly taking its toll on the morale and readiness of our troops.

These 25 deployments have cost taxpayers over \$15 billion. By the end of the year, President Clinton's Bosnia operation will have cost \$9.4 billion. If this administration is truly concerned about cutting costs, the president should reconsider how he utilizes our military. More important, he needs to take action in convincing our allies to foot a greater portion of the cost of these deployments.

*Rep. Curt Weldon, R-Pa., is a member of the House Committee on National Security and chairman of the subcommittee on research and development.*

Fort Worth Star-Telegram

April 7, 1998

### No Surprise

Given that the Iraqis had seven years to remove any evidence of chemical or biological weapons from their nation's presidential palaces, did anyone really expect Saddam Hussein's compounds to be anything other than squeaky clean when U.N. inspectors were finally allowed inside?

If this was the first real test of the Feb. 23 accord reached between Iraq and the United Nations to avert a military confrontation, then it was a no-brainer. No one expected a consummate cheat like Saddam to fail.

Washington Times Apr. 8, 1998 Pg. 16

## Getting the bases closed

Ever the consummate politician, Bill Clinton has never met an issue he couldn't — and wouldn't — politicize, especially if there was a vote or two in it for him. By doing what his predecessor refused to do — i.e., politicize the highly volatile issue of domestic military base closings in search of electoral votes in the big enchiladas of Texas and California — Commander in Chief Clinton may have jeopardized the nation's long-term national security.

Congressional feelings understandably remain bitter and enraged over Mr. Clinton's unprecedented privatization of two employee-rich Air Force maintenance depots in Texas and California that the Base Closure and Realignment Commission had recommended be closed in the 1995 base-closing round. As recently as last year, the U.S. Senate voted 66 to 33 to reject authorization for two more rounds of closings.

Now comes Mr. Clinton's Secretary of Defense William Cohen seeking authorization once again to initiate base-closing rounds. In recognition of the poisonous atmosphere his boss has contributed to this difficult issue, Mr. Cohen has proposed to begin the next round in 2001 — after Mr. Clinton's term expires. It was originally scheduled for 1999. The second round would be pushed back to 2005.

Mr. Cohen makes a solid case for the need to close more bases. In a recent analysis reviewing the cost savings from the 97 bases that were closed in earlier rounds, the Pentagon reports that it will have saved more money than previously projected. Having recovered billions of up-front costs, the base closure process will break even this year. By 2001, cumulative net savings will approach \$14 billion, and annual savings thereafter will exceed \$5 billion. Two additional rounds will generate extra annual savings of \$3 billion.

Indisputably, the military's current base structure vastly exceeds its current and projected force structure. The total number of troops is down 40 percent since 1989. While the Army will have 43 percent fewer soldiers in 2003 than it had in 1989, the number of classrooms will have been cut a mere 7 percent. The number of ships in the Navy will have declined by nearly 50 percent during the same period, but berthing space will have shrunk by less than 20 percent. A study by the Defense Department reveals that the department will have a 23 percent excess base capacity after all the previous base closings are completed.

If you thought hammers, toilet seats and coffee makers were unnecessarily expensive during the Reagan buildup that won the Cold War, consider how excess base capacity will rob the Pentagon of the funds needed to finance the next generation of weapons for the next century. For years, the military has been short-changing its procurement of new weapons in order to absorb the dramatic reductions in defense expenditures demanded by Mr. Clinton as his price to balance the budget. As a percentage of total economic output, or gross domestic product (GDP), defense spending has fallen from 6.2 percent in 1986 to 4.9 percent in 1992 to 3.2 percent in 1998. In inflation-adjusted dol-

lars, procurement outlays have declined by nearly 60 percent since 1986. As a percentage of GDP, procurement has decreased by more than 70 percent since 1986, falling from 1.75 percent to 0.52 percent. Yes, the Cold War is over, but defense spending as a percentage of GDP has collapsed to levels not seen since 1948, two years before the Korean War.

Mr. Cohen has made it explicitly clear. With the

tough spending restrictions imposed by the balanced-budget agreement, a primary source of funding for the purchase of desperately needed modernized weapons systems must come from the savings realized from closing unneeded domestic bases. Like it or not, that is fiscal and national-security reality. Too bad Mr. Cohen's boss has made a tough sell even tougher.

Long Island Newsday

April 7, 1998

Pg. 43

## Army Must View Women as Equals

By Valorie K. Vojdik

"BRENDA HOSTER needs to be taught a lesson," proclaimed Sgt. Maj. Gene McKinney's lawyer after a jury acquitted his client of 18 counts of sexual misconduct. Convicted of covering up the harassment he denies happened, McKinney retaliated by slapping Hoster with a \$1.5-million libel suit. His attorney denounced Hoster and the other women who accused McKinney as "liars, cheats and frauds." The lesson for Brenda Hoster? Don't complain about sexual harassment.

Rocked by the harassment and assault of female recruits at the Aberdeen training ground, the Army established a hot line and encouraged women to report sexual harassment. Six women mustered the courage to complain that McKinney, their commander, sexually harassed them in similar ways. Having broken ranks to accuse the highest enlisted officer of sexual misconduct, the women were subjected to threats of retaliation and ostracism. One complainant was placed in a witness-protection program after she received threats from men furious at her charges.

After a monthlong trial, a military jury convicted McKinney of obstructing the Army's investigation of the harassment allegations. The jury nevertheless disregarded the testimony of not one, but all six, women and refused to convict McKinney of sexual misconduct. Although McKinney was convicted of a felony, he walked away with a reduction in rank, a slap on the wrist.

The treatment of Brenda Hoster confirms what women already know: It's not worth it to report sexual harassment. While sexual harassment is rampant in the Army, the per-

centage of military women who file complaints is astoundingly low. An Army senior review panel on sexual harassment recently reported that nearly 80 percent of Army personnel have witnessed or experienced sexual harassment; yet few report it. Soldiers have little confidence in the Army's ability or willingness to handle harassment complaints. Female soldiers who complain are often "blackballed" and suffer reprisals by their commanders and fellow soldiers. As one female soldier bluntly said, "Wake up. As soon as you speak up, there's problems."

The jury's refusal to believe these six women, and the lenient treatment of the accused's efforts to obstruct the investigation of their charges, tells women that complaints of harassment are not only useless, but hazardous to one's career.

To its credit, the Army responded swiftly to the Aberdeen scandal and devoted substantial resources to McKinney's prosecution. But sexual harassment is deeply entrenched in the military. Given the culture of harassment, it is not surprising that a military jury composed mostly of men would be reluctant to convict McKinney for criminal sexual misconduct, especially where a conviction would subject him to up to 40 years in prison.

The answer is not, as some suggest, to segregate men and women in basic training. Segregation sends the message that the Army can't protect women. It reinforces the myth that women are special and different and need protection - precisely the rationale for keeping them out of the military. The Army instead needs to develop uniform and reliable procedures to redress violations.

The Army has a written policy that prohibits sexual har-

assment, but commanding officers have broad discretion to handle harassment within their units. The Uniform Code of Military Justice does not include sexual harassment as a specific offense. Mistreatment of a public animal is an offense, but sexual harassment is not. The Army's failure to codify sexual harassment as an offense, and set appropriate penalties, undercuts its policy of zero tolerance. Prosecutors were forced to charge McKinney with other offenses that carried penalties of up to 40 years in prison, which likely contributed to the jury's reluctance to convict. The burden of proof for criminal charges is far greater than in civil cases, increasing the probability of ac-

quittal. The upshot? Improper conduct that would trigger liability in the civilian world goes unpunished in the military.

The integration of women profoundly threatens the culture of masculinity that pervades the military. Sexual harassment keeps women in their place, defining them as sexual objects rather than as equals, and preserves the military for men. The answer is not to segregate men and women, but to insist that women are treated as equals. The military must restore faith that it quickly and fairly punishes the perpetrators and does not destroy their victims. Brenda Hoster deserved better.

*Valorie Vojdik, law professor at Western New England College of Law, represented Shannon Faulkner in her battle to be admitted to The Citadel.*

Wall Street Journal (Europe) April 8, 1998

## Was Clausewitz Wrong?

By Joseph F. Pilat and Terence T. Taylor

Just over one month ago, Iraq's failure to allow weapons inspectors into eight presidential palaces threatened to spark a conflict between Iraq and the United States and Britain. But last week, under the United Nations agreement struck in February, U.N. inspectors were able to search the palaces for evidence of biological and chemical weapons programs.

As the dust settles it's clear that some are drawing the wrong lessons from the affair. Just recently, U.N. High Commissioner for Human Rights Mary Robinson said that the agreement was a triumph of diplomacy over force. The Russians, of course, are pushing a similar line. The argument suggests that Clausewitz was wrong--that there is no relationship between force (war) and diplomacy (politics).

Of course, this view is specious. But the contention by some commentators that the failure to use force led to appeasement (diplomacy) is also problematic.

In the end, it was the threat of unilateral force combined with--and complemented by--multilateral diplomacy that resolved the latest crisis. As U.N. Secretary General Kofi Annan recognized, the threat of an attack by the United States and the United Kingdom was instrumental in reaching the agreement.

Some pundits were opposed to just such a diplomatic solution, suggesting that military strikes were called for to face down Iraqi defiance of the international community. But there was little support for air strikes. It is also difficult to see how military action short of an invasion in February would have gained U.N. inspector's greater access than that reached



in the diplomatic agreement.

The view advanced that an attack was necessary to show "resolve" is belied by Iraqi behavior. Notwithstanding official proclamations of victory, Iraq's decision to accept an agreement that requires significant concessions suggests resolve had at least some effect.

Whether or not the agreement holds, this point should not be forgotten. If the agreement is violated by Iraq, military options should, rightly, once again come to the fore. The U.S. decision to retain forces in the region and the effort to build diplomatic support for the possible future use

of force is crucial to ensure compliance. As long as Iraqi deadly weapons continue to pose a threat, force must remain an option.

Some advocating force were also disappointed by the diplomatic resolution because they saw it as diluting America's power, putting in question its right to act unilaterally. The failure of the United States to bomb Iraq seemed to support this view. But to suggest that the U.S. (or Britain) was unwilling to go it alone, implies that the threats as well as the costly deployments required to give them credibility were

empty ruses. It also suggests that the agreement was used as a face-saving way to back down. But again, this perspective is belied by Iraq's concessions. The U.S. was getting results. There were even reports that the U.S. was involved behind the scenes in setting the terms of the agreement to search to the presidential palaces.

The uncertainties of the agreement notwithstanding, it probably was the best (or least worse) outcome at the time. And, because it was reached in the context of credible and unambiguous threats of force by the Clinton administration and

the Blair government, it would appear that Clausewitz was right after all.

The complex relationships of force and diplomacy have played out in the Gulf as they have time and time again in the past, and there is every indication that they reflect the shape of things to come. Policy makers and pundits can ignore this reality, so well understood by the great German strategist, only at their peril.

*Messrs. Pilat and Taylor are, respectively, research associate and assistant director at the International Institute for Strategic Studies in London.*

New York Times

April 8, 1998

## Taking the Terror Out of Bioterrorism

By Jessica Stern

WASHINGTON -- We've heard a lot recently about the horrors of biological weapons. Anyone with a biology degree, a crop duster and a grievance could kill you in your sleep along with millions of your neighbors, we are told.

True, biological weapons are potentially as deadly as nuclear weapons. One hundred kilograms of anthrax, less than the amount produced by Iraq, could kill millions if dispersed under ideal conditions. And unlike fertilizer bombs, such as the one used in the Oklahoma City bombing, biological weapons are invisible and silent killers.

These facts warrant concern, but not panic. Although biological agents are relatively easy to grow or obtain, it is not enough just to acquire them. They must be spread effectively. Few countries, and even fewer terrorist groups, if any, are now capable of launching an open-air attack that would create mass casualties.

Even sophisticated terrorists have had a hard time making good on the threat of biological terrorism. The Aum Shinrikyo cult in Japan had more than a billion dollars in assets and 50,000 members, several of whom were skilled biologists. But the cult was unable to mount a successful biological attack despite numerous attempts. Instead, it used a nerve gas, sarin, to kill 12 people in an attack on the Toyko subway.

If practically anybody could make a biological weapon in his bathtub, effective countermeasures would be difficult to devise. And if no terrorist could get one at all, we could just relax. The truth lies in between.

Terrorists have long been capable of committing acts more lethal than those they have actually carried out. Until recently, however, most were satisfied to commit symbolic acts of terror rather than kill large numbers of people. No longer. Some radical Islamic fundamentalists, for example, have made it clear they are determined to punish their enemies in the most extreme ways possible.

But successful efforts to create mass casualties are likely to remain rare. In any case, the weapons of choice are more likely to be common industrial or agricultural chemicals, which though less toxic than warfare agents are easier to procure. The 1984 accident in Bhopal, India, where toxic industrial chemicals leaked from a plant and killed as many as 4,000 people overnight, taught us all how dangerous exposure to some chemicals can be.

Terrorists and criminals have used poisons to carry out assassinations or to attempt extortion. In the United States, some far-right militia groups and survivalists have shown interest in simple biological weapons. For example, in 1995, members of the Minnesota Patriots Council were

found guilty of producing the toxin ricin -- made from castor beans -- in a plot to assassinate a deputy United States marshal.

Some terrorists might try carrying out low-technology attacks, like disseminating pathogens in enclosed spaces, or poisoning pharmaceuticals, prepared foods, livestock or crops. Attacks of this kind would not kill millions, but their effects could still be devastating.

The most troubling prospect is state-sponsored terrorist attacks of the kind Iraq has threatened to carry out against Britain -- for example, by putting anthrax in duty-free bottles of alcohol, cosmetics and perfume.

But in such cases, the state sponsor would presumably weigh the risk of retaliation.

The United States is currently tightening its counterterrorism laws and improving its ability to save lives in the event of attacks involving biological agents. Still, more needs to be done. Drugs may counteract the effects of some biological agents, but only if doctors know an attack has occurred before symptoms appear. Vaccines, if available, can be administered to prevent the spread of some agents from person to person.

But pharmaceuticals have to be stockpiled and new drugs must be developed. The system for domestic and global monitoring of disease outbreaks in humans, animals and plants

needs to be strengthened. And detectors capable of rapid identification of biological agents need to be developed and deployed.

The most important measure of all may be finding employment for former Soviet biological-weapons scientists, many of whom are now unemployed or underpaid. If even a few of these scientists decide to assist terrorists or the states that support them, the results could be calamitous, especially if organized crime becomes involved, as some fear might happen.

Some steps can be taken immediately. We can toughen the laws governing acquisition of biological agents. As the law now stands, it is not illegal to possess biological agents. Dermatologists use botulinum toxin, for example, in routine procedures, like removing wrinkles. Since 1997, shippers and receivers of a specified list of microorganisms have been required to register with the Centers for Disease Control. But no law prohibits people from deliberately isolating biological agents from nature. Registration of all such agents should be required.

The international law governing biological weapons is also weak. Unlike the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty and the Chemical Weapons Convention, the Biological Weapons Convention of 1972 includes no inspection protocol. Had such a mechanism been in place in 1979, investigators could have looked into speculation about an outbreak of anthrax in Sverdlovsk (now



Ekaterinburg) in Russia. Boris Yeltsin, the Russian President, admitted in 1994 that the outbreak was caused by an accidental release from a banned biological-weapons site.

No inspection regime can guarantee compliance. But the riskier and more expensive biological weapons programs become, the harder it will be for terrorists to acquire sophis-

ticated systems for delivering them.

Terrorist attacks using biological weapons are not inevitable, and there is much that can be done to reduce the threat. It makes sense to take action now, rather than after the first deadly attack.

*Jessica Stern is the author of the forthcoming "Risk and Dread: Preempting the New Terrorists."*

China has imprisoned more than 2,000 people for "counterrevolutionary" crimes and has detained thousands without trial in "re-education" camps, according to a speech by the U.S. ambassador to the U.N. He urged Beijing to correct such abuses.

Wall Street  
Journal  
April 8, 1998  
Pg. 1

Yeltsin met with leaders of the Communist-controlled Duma in a bid to secure approval of his nominee to head a new Russian government. Opposition leaders say Yeltsin's 35-year-old choice for premier, Sergei Kiriyenko, is too inexperienced and are pressing for a coalition government.

# Moscow's man in Tehran

JAMES HACKETT

Washington Times  
April 8, 1998  
Pg. 15

In a feature story entitled "Our Man in Tehran," the Moscow journal *Novaya Gazeta* on March 16 ran an investigative report of Russian assistance to Iran's ballistic missile program. The author interviewed both scientists who had gone to Iran and Russian government officials. All those who spoke with the journal were nervous and insisted on anonymity.

From the interviews a pattern emerged that describes the transfer of expertise in advanced military technology. Rather than hardware, says the author, Iran is buying the knowledge of "leading Russian experts on the production of the most modern weapons of mass destruction." These experts worked for years in secret government facilities, then moved to new jobs in universities after the Soviet collapse. Because they had knowledge of state secrets, they were denied passports to travel abroad, even on vacation.

They were contacted by Iranian graduate students at Russian universities, who extended invitations to visit Iran. If they accepted, their passport applications were suddenly approved by the same Federal Security Service (the FSB is the successor to the KGB) that denied their travel to other destinations.

On arrival in Iran, the Russian "guest" receives red carpet treatment. Met at the airport by a Mercedes, he is whisked to a five-room suite in a luxury hotel. During the next week he attends meetings in a secret facility near Tehran, where Iranian missile engineers ask specific questions about ballistic missile production.

Iran already produces and assembles a half-dozen different short-range ballistic and cruise missiles. What Tehran now wants is production technology for medium-range missiles that can travel 2,000 kilometers. After that, says one of the Russian experts, the Iranians

want to learn how to produce inter-continental ballistic missiles that can "reach the Americans." They intend to produce their own long-range missiles and are willing to pay for the expertise they need. And getting that expertise from Russia is a bargain.

During his week in Iran, the guest sees about a dozen familiar faces from secret Russian military institutes already working there. They are "top-class experts" in such fields as metallurgy, composite materials, and rocket engines. At the end of his visit, the guest is offered a two-year contract to join them that includes a comfortable apartment, all meals provided, a chauffeur-driven Mercedes, a personal translator, two months paid vacation, and \$1,000 a month. While an American or German would expect 10 times as much, it is a high wage for a Russian expert who is being paid a pittance at home.

The decision to send specialists to Iran was made by the Politburo in 1986. Russian missile experts have been there since 1994, says the reporter, applying technologies that took Russia decades to develop. With missile production and test facilities already in place, Russian experts believe Iran can shorten the time it takes to develop a big missile from 15 years to five by buying advanced technology.

The author of the article asked how these experts with highly classified knowledge got passports valid for travel to Iran without FSB approval. The people she interviewed said she was naive — the FSB not only approved their travel but facilitated it. One official explained the policy of the state arms export company: Everything that can be sold should be sold, to anyone who will pay for it.

But has this changed? In response to U.S. pressure to stop military assistance to Iran, Prime Minister

Viktor Chernomyrdin on Jan. 22 signed Decree 57, establishing tighter controls on exports of goods and services. The reporter concludes with the cynical observation that there are plenty of loopholes in the law, and no ban can restrain world-class scientists who are being paid near the minimum wage.

This story, pieced together from interviews with Russians who traveled to Iran, helps explain recent claims of rapid Iranian advances in missile technology. Published reports attributed to Israeli and U.S. intelligence sources contend that Iran's Shahab-3 missile with a range of 1,300 km, which can reach all of Israel, has been ground-tested six times and should be ready for flight-testing next year. The 2,000 km Shahab-4 may take a few years longer, but if more than a dozen Russian experts have been working on it since 1994, as the *Novaya Gazeta* article claims, serious concern is justified.

Recognizing the growing danger, on March 30 the House passed the Iran Missile Protection Act of 1998, sponsored by Rep. Curt Weldon of Pennsylvania. It authorizes \$147 million to accelerate development of improved theater missile defenses for U.S. forces, and to coordinate U.S. and Israeli missile defenses. The Senate has passed a similar amendment to the fiscal 1998 supplemental appropriation, sponsored by Sen. Jon Kyl of Arizona, virtually assuring additional funds this year.

But it also is important for Congress to appropriate at least the full amounts requested in fiscal 1999 for the theater missile defenses needed to protect against the longer-range missiles Iran is rapidly developing with help from its Russian friends.

*James T. Hackett is a contributing writer to The Washington Times based in San Diego.*

New York Times

April 8, 1998

## Watching a Saudi Succession

King Fahd's recent hospitalization was a reminder of the 76-year-old Saudi monarch's frailty. Power has been shifting to his half-brother, Crown Prince Abdullah, since the King suffered a debilitating stroke in 1995. The Crown Prince is not as quick to embrace some American policy positions as King Fahd, and is more sympathetic to Arab and Islamic causes.

But the coming transition need not upset relations between Washington and Riyadh.

Saudi Arabia is an absolute monarchy, where oil revenues lubricate corruption among royal princes, and civil liberties are denied. But its policies, and its stability, are critically important to the United States. The kingdom plays a dominant role in setting oil prices, and its support is essential to Washington's ability to project military power in the Persian Gulf. Recent outbreaks of Islamic terrorism in Saudi Arabia, including attacks against American installations there, are an indication of problems in the kingdom that Washington cannot afford to ignore. Reduced Saudi oil revenues and excessive purchases of expensive military

equipment have created an unaccustomed fiscal squeeze that the Saudi Government needs to address.

Crown Prince Abdullah has been frank about giving Saudi Arabia's national interests, as he sees them, precedence over diplomatic exhortations from Washington. He is friendly with Syria, has drawn attention to the suffering of Iraqi civilians and has led in repairing Saudi relations with Iran.

But his more austere, independent approach is not necessarily bad for the United States. Though like King Fahd he resisted new American military action against Iraq earlier this year, Crown Prince Abdullah seems to understand the grave dangers Saddam Hussein continues to pose to Saudi Arabia. He has also called for reforms of the financial, welfare and education systems and for a crackdown on corruption in the royal family.

It is regrettable that the interests of the world's most powerful democracy are tied to the narrow dynastic politics of the Saudi leaders. One way to make that dependence less risky in the future and more bearable today is for Washington to encourage Crown Prince Abdullah not only to modernize, but also to make Saudi Arabia more democratic.

## Gender-integrated training improves the performance of men and women

In his April 2 Op-Ed piece, Brian Mitchell breezily claims that the Armed Services coddle women by holding them to lower performance standards ("Do we need women in the military?"). This view reflects an outdated personal bias rather than the experiences of today's soldier.

It should be no surprise that Mr. Mitchell had to reach back more than 20 years for an example of training tensions between male and female cadets at the Air Force Academy. He chose an ironic example since, within the military, the Air Force graduates the highest percentage of women — 24 percent — from basic training each year. According to a 1995 Defense Department study, it also has the lowest number of women who claim they have experienced any form of sexual harassment.

Mr. Mitchell sets himself against thousands of personnel surveyed since 1992 by the Army, the Rand Corp., the Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute and the Defense Advisory Commission on

Women in the Services. All of these studies found that the people who run and participate in gender-integrated training programs are the most enthusiastic proponents of this approach to preparing for military service.

The evidence clearly demonstrates that men and women who train together to support the war-fighting needs of the 21st-century military have a solid understanding of how they should interact on a daily basis in the field or the fleet. Women from mixed-training environments consistently achieve higher skill levels than those who work in segregated units. At the same time — as almost 4,000 soldiers told the Army during a 1995 assessment — men who operate in integrated components sustain high performance records.

Finally, Mr. Mitchell deceptively cites the December 1997 gender-integrated training report of the commission headed by former Sen. Nancy Kassebaum Baker. The Kassebaum Baker commission, according to Mr. Mitchell, "admits

that if men are trained separately, they can be held to a higher standard."

Yet this report endorsed the continuation of gender-integrated training at every level above boot camp, called for the hiring of more female instructors and urged the elimination of the ridiculous "no talk, no touch" policy on contact between men and women. The key recommendation of the Kassebaum Baker report focused on the establishment of high standards for all trainees regardless of their gender.

Mr. Mitchell ends his piece with another misplaced question: "If men can meet a higher standard," he writes, "why do we bother with women?" But recruits and commanders have already given us the answer: Gender-integrated training improves the performance of both men and women in the military and prepares them for the future battles they must fight and win together.

OLYMPIA J. SNOWE  
U.S. Senate  
Washington

**Editor's Note:** The op-ed referred to appeared in the *Current News Early Bird*, April 2, 1998, Pg. 8.

Chicago Tribune

April 7, 1998

Pg. 4

## Push For Base Closings Accentuates Negatives Cohen Works On Stubborn Congress

By Michael Kilian  
Washington Bureau

WASHINGTON--Defense Secretary William Cohen warned Monday that the government might let selected military bases fall into disrepair

if Congress does not agree to his demand for two more rounds of politically sensitive base reductions in the years 2001 and 2005.

"It's possible that we would start to let a number of those facilities which are not so-called core facilities start to

deteriorate," Cohen said. "Repairs would go unmet. There would be a degradation of facilities. There would be a loss of morale... on the part of the people there, both the civilian and military work force, and ultimately the community would be the major loser since you'd have no assistance coming from the federal govern-

ment to help them redevelop."

Cohen said the only other alternative would be to make deep cuts in new aircraft and other weapons programs needed to modernize U.S. national security for the next century.

The defense secretary insisted he was not personally advocating these drastic steps. His airing of such threats was viewed as an escalation of his

struggle to get a stubborn Congress to yield on base closures.

Thus far, members of both houses have responded to Cohen's call last week for new rounds of closings with stony silence or outright opposition.

In Illinois, where the Rock Island Arsenal and Scott Air Force Base are considered possible targets of new closures, Sens. Dick Durbin and Carol Moseley-Braun and Reps. Rod Blagojevich and Lane Evans, the two Illinois members of the House National Security Committee, expressed serious reservations.

"Illinois has already had a disproportionate percent of base closings," Moseley-Braun complained.

Other members of Congress have argued the nation is still

absorbing the economic impact of four previous rounds of base eliminations. There are also complaints that the Clinton administration politicized the supposedly impartial process by keeping open two large, unneeded bases in politically powerful California and Texas when the president was up for re-election in 1996.

"My response is that, if you don't like what has happened in the past, much as I didn't like what happened to me (in the Senate) as a member of the Armed Services Committee, (work) in the chamber so that it won't happen next time," Cohen said. "I don't think it's a viable excuse for a member saying there'll never be another (base-reduction) round."

Cohen contends that two

more rounds will save an initial \$20 billion to \$21 billion and a continuing \$3 billion a year, sums vital to new weapons acquisition.

He was asked how such money could be so needed when the federal government is experiencing budgetary surpluses and Cohen is spending some \$350 billion on new tactical aircraft alone.

In responding, he noted that he's reduced to 548 an initial request for 1,000 new Navy F/A-18 jets and has ordered substantial reductions in the new F-22 program, which has been plagued with cost overruns.

He defended the money spent to maintain the nation's fleet of 96 B-1 bombers, though that \$300 million-a-copy Cold

War-era strategic bomber never flew an actual combat mission, even in the Persian Gulf war.

"I think the B-1 performs a valuable function for us," Cohen said. "Their presence over there (in the recent Iraqi UN inspections emergency) had an impact on the gulf nations that agreed to accommodate them, and I also think they had an impact on (Iraqi leader) Saddam Hussein."

Asked to justify having what amounts to a staff of 3,000 in his Office of the Secretary of Defense, a third more than were there during the Vietnam War, Cohen said he was working to cut that back to 2,000 and that a large staff was needed.

"It's a very big institution that we have," he said. "We have 2.4 million people in the military."

Boston Globe

April 7, 1998

Pg. 16

## Defense effort will pay a price if bases stay open, Cohen says

By Chris Black  
Globe Staff

WASHINGTON - Defense Secretary William S. Cohen said yesterday that Congress faces a choice between military bases and manufacturing jobs as it considers the administration's proposal to hold two more rounds of base closings.

Cohen said the Defense Department will be unable to modernize its weaponry or maintain combat-ready troops as soon as 2006 if Congress blocks the Pentagon's attempts to reduce overhead by closing bases. Without cuts, the Pentagon will not be able to purchase military hardware manufactured by defense contractors.

"Unless we get the savings ... I will not be able to achieve the modernization goals or to find the resources necessary to avoid an erosion of readiness," Cohen said.

"Virtually everyone who has looked at this says this has to be done, you are carrying too much infrastructure and if you do not shed the infrastructure and get it down to manageable levels, then you will not be able to do the other things," he said.

New England is unlikely to be the first place the Pentagon looks for savings because there

are few military installations in the region, according to congressional and military officials. For the past 25 years, military facilities have been consolidated predominantly in the South.

During the first four rounds of base closings between 1988 and 1995, New England lost Fort Devens in Ayer, the last active Army base in the region; the Army Materials Technology Laboratory, better known as the Watertown Arsenal; Pease Air Force Base in New Hampshire; Loring Air Force Base in Maine; and the Naval Air Station in South Weymouth.

In the last round in 1995, New England business and political officials lobbied fiercely to protect Hanscom Air Force Base in Bedford, a research center; and the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard in Kittery, Maine, a repair facility for nuclear-powered submarines.

At that time, officials said the proximity of Hanscom to universities and high technology firms could not be replicated elsewhere. In Portsmouth's case, the Navy decided that it needs two installations capable of repairing nuclear submarines in case an emergency puts one facility out of operation. Officials said the

military has not changed its views on those two facilities.

Last year Congress resisted Cohen's call for base closings in 1999 and 2001 and instead ordered the Pentagon to study the issue.

Congress had established the base-closing commission to make the hard decisions about which bases to close, and some lawmakers resented the political interference with the process in 1995 when President Clinton ordered maintenance depots in Texas and California to be turned over to private companies rather than be shut down.

The economics of base closings are complicated because it costs money to shut down a facility.

A new Defense Department report shows the savings from past base closings will reach \$14 billion in 2001 and will amount to \$5.6 billion each

subsequent year, higher figures than originally estimated.

Cohen said the current base structure is about 23 percent larger than needed, and he renewed his call for two more rounds of base closings. He said base closings in 2001 and 2005 would save about \$20 billion between 2008 and 2015 that could be invested in military hardware and training.

"There is a penalty," Cohen said, for keeping all existing bases. "The fact is we are now living in a balanced budget environment. Unless Congress is willing to see this kind of erosion in procurement and readiness, they are going to have to face up to their responsibility as well."

Cohen was a senator from Maine when the Pentagon shut down two major facilities that affected jobs for his constituents: Pease in 1988 and Loring in 1991.

"I didn't like what happened to me," he said. But "in the very foreseeable future we are going to hand to our successors a system which is dysfunctional."

USA Today

April 8, 1998

Pg. 11

**BRASS OVERDOSE:** The armed services are overloaded with brass, a report by the Project on Government Oversight says. "Officer inflation in the U.S. military has reached an all-time high," it says. "We're running the risk of creating a military force of bureaucrats rather than warriors." There are almost enough admirals to put one on every ship, 30 generals for every active Army division and only 23 aircraft for every Air Force general, the study says. There are twice as many officers per enlisted personnel as at the end of World War II. Pentagon officials say the military has become so high-tech that it

needs more military managers with long experience, and there's actually a shortage of top officers in some areas. The report suggests giving some specialty jobs, in law and public affairs for example, to civilians in order to cut costs and reduce the "bloated officer corps."

# AWOL Marine charges bigotry at APG

Baltimore Sun  
April 8, 1998  
Pg. 2C

## Jewish private blames 'escalating pattern' of anti-Semitism

By NEAL THOMPSON  
SUN STAFF

A Jewish Marine who fled his post at Aberdeen Proving Ground last month said yesterday he went AWOL to avoid the anti-Semitic harassment he suffered there, culminating in a derogatory remark he says someone scribbled on his door.

Joshua S. Narins, 26, a private based at Aberdeen's weapons school, said he will surrender to Aberdeen authorities today. But first, he will hand over a petition asking Marine Corps Commandant Gen. Charles C. Krulak to investigate hate crimes and "racist and/or extremist activity within the ranks of the Marine Corps, particularly at ... Aberdeen."

Aberdeen and Marine Corps officials said they had questions about the validity of Narins' harassment complaint but would investigate.

Lt. Col. Scott Campbell, a spokesman at Marine Corps' headquarters in Washington, said that Narins' allegations are being taken seriously and that "if these things are corroborated, somebody will be held accountable."

But Ed Starnes, a spokesman for the Ordnance Center and School where Narins was based, said, "There's been some question about who wrote the [derogatory remark on his door] — including, possibly, himself."

First, however, the Marines want to apprehend Narins for his unauthorized departure Feb. 21. Narins was declared a deserter 30 days later. "We're trying to gather information on the allegations," said Capt. Douglas Hibbard, a top Marine staff member at the Aberdeen Army base. "But desertion is a serious offense."

Narins, of Bernardsville, N.J.,

the son of a retired lieutenant colonel, enlisted in the Marines in May. After completing basic training at Parris Island, S.C., he was assigned in August to Aberdeen, where he was being trained to repair sight devices used to aim weapons.

In his letter to Krulak, he claims he was subjected to an "escalating pattern of harassment" that culminated Feb. 17, when someone wrote "kike — gas em" on the 3-by-5-inch name card on his barracks door.

According to Narins' attorney, Narins told two superiors of the harassment, but they did not convince him that they could ensure his safety. "He was really frightened," said Tod Ensign, director of Citizen Soldier in New York, a nonprofit advocacy group representing Narins. "He just felt like he had to leave."

Narins, with his parents and lawyer, will speak at a news conference scheduled for 10 a.m. today at the Holiday Inn in downtown Baltimore, where he will release copies of his letter to Krulak and then surrender.

The harassment claims come two years after Aberdeen went from an obscure outpost to home of the Army's worst sex scandal. A dozen male trainers were charged with raping or harassing female subordinates. Four were sent to

prison, and the others were discharged or resigned.

But last month, Army leadership and the Army's inspector general announced an investigation into whether black instructors were targeted for prosecution. Investigators plan to look into whether the sex charges were racially motivated.

The military has faced many questions in recent years about racial discrimination and extremist tendencies in its ranks.

Last year, a sergeant was discharged from Fort Bragg, N.C., for painting swastikas on a barracks door. And in December, seven former Marine Corps military police officers were indicted for assaulting illegal immigrants living in bushes outside Camp Pendleton in San Diego. Those and other incidents have fueled fears that the military has become a breeding ground for extremists opposed to minorities, women and gays.

Many of those fears are also tied to last year's conviction of two Army paratroopers who were sentenced to life in prison for killing a black couple in Fayetteville, N.C., near Fort Bragg, in what prosecutors claimed was a skinhead initiation rite. An Army task force investigated white supremacist activity in the Army and found "minimal evidence."

European Stars & Stripes April 8, 1998

Pg. 3

## Gays will still be banned

LONDON — The British Ministry of Defense has denied various media reports that its military planned to lift its ban on homosexuals.

The reports are "complete rubbish," Ailsa McIntyre, the ministry's senior press officer, said in a telephone interview Tuesday.

McIntyre said the ban will be maintained until a review is conducted in about three years.

The United States military has a policy on homosexuals called "don't ask, don't tell." The "don't ask" provision prohibits commanders from initiating investigations of homosexual activity unless they first receive evidence that such activity has occurred.

The "don't tell" provision requires homosexuals to keep their sexuality private. If they don't do so, they face dismissal.

— From staff reports

American mediator Dennis Ross will probably resume shuttling in the Middle East after the Passover holidays as the Clinton administration searches for ways to reopen negotiations between Israel and the Palestinians. "We are running out of refinements," a senior administration official said yesterday in divulging the likely new Ross mission as the result of a 90-minute review by President Clinton.

Philadelphia  
Inquirer  
April 8, 1998  
Pg. 4

CURRENT NEWS SERVICE  
ROOM 4C881, PENTAGON, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20301-7500  
Tel: (703)695-2884 / 697-8765 Fax: (703)695-6822/7260

CHIEF: Richard Oleszewski NEWS DIRECTOR: Taft Phoebus EARLY BIRD EDITOR: Linda Lee  
EDITORS: Elmer Christian, Erik Erickson, Janice Goff, Meredith Johnson  
SYSTEMS ADMINISTRATOR: Carol Rippe ADMINISTRATION: Wendy Powers PRODUCTION: Defense Automated Printing Service (Room 3A1037)